

why should three
rich brothers , who
are biased and
willing storm
troopers for the
Bush campaign,
decide what people
see on their
television?

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to force
their stations to
air an anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.

There are too many
rich conservatives
who decide what the
American public
sees, and this must
be regulated. If
not, then television
risks not being
believed, and "news"
will be seen as only
someone's biased
opinion.

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, and is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest. But when
large companies
control the
airwaves, we get
more of what's good
for the bottom line
and less of what we
need for our
democracy. Instead
of something
produced at "News
Central" far away,
it's more important
that we see real
people from our own
communities and more
substantive news
about issues that
matter.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. They
show why the license
renewal process
needs to involve

more than a returned
postcard. Thank you.